

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 22-07792-MWF (DFM)

Date: March 29, 2023

Title Tiger Construction, LLC et al v. Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles et al

Present: The Honorable Douglas F. McCormick, United States Magistrate Judge	
Nancy Boehme	Court Reporter
Deputy Clerk	Not Present
Attorney(s) for Plaintiff(s):	Attorney(s) for Defendant(s):
Not Present	Not Present
Proceedings:	(IN CHAMBERS) Order to Show Cause re Service

On October 25, 2022, Plaintiffs Tiger Construction, LLC and Mohsen H. Ahmed, Jr. filed this pro se civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. See Dkt. 1. The Court explained that Tiger Construction could not appear unless represented by an attorney. See Dkts. 4, 8. In response, Ahmed filed the operative Second Amended Complaint, which no longer includes Tiger Construction as a plaintiff. See Dkt. 9. On December 28, 2022, the Clerk of Court issued a Summons. See Dkt. 10.

Three months have passed and there is no record that Plaintiff has properly served any Defendant. “If a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court—on its own motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff—must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). The Court “must extend” the time for service if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure. Id.

Plaintiff is ordered to show cause within seven (7) days why this action should not be dismissed for failure to effectuate service. Plaintiff’s filing of the proof of service of the Summons and Second Amended Complaint on Defendants is sufficient to discharge this order. Failure to respond may result in dismissal.